



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP  
P.O. Box 51418  
Palo Alto CA 94303

**COPY MAILED**

MAR 3 1 2008

In re Application of  
Peter Arthur Schade  
Application No. 10/811,455  
Filed: March 25, 2004  
Attorney Docket Number: 2812P

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

**ON PETITION**

This is a decision on the petition filed September 11, 2007, under 37 CFR 1.137(a) to revive the above-identified application.

The petition to revive under 37 CFR § 1.137(a) is **DISMISSED**.

Any request for reconsideration must be submitted within TWO (2) MONTHS from the mail date of this decision. Extensions of time under 37 CFR § 1.136(a) are permitted. The reconsideration request should include a cover letter entitled "Renewed Petition under 37 CFR § 1.137(a)." This is **not** a final agency action within the meaning of 5 U.S.C. § 704.

This application became abandoned for failure to timely submit the issue and publication fees, as required by the Notice of Allowance and Fee (s) Due which was mailed January 11, 2007. The Notice of Allowance and Fee (s) Due set a three (3) month statutory period for reply. Extensions of time were not available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). Accordingly, this application became abandoned on April 12, 2007. A Notice of Abandonment was mailed on May 8, 2007.

Petitioner contends a reply to the Notice of Allowance and Issue Fee Due was submitted December 7, 2006.

**PETITION TO REVIVE UNDER 37 CFR § 1.137(a)**

A grantable petition under 37 CFR § 1.137(a) must be accompanied by:

- (1) the required reply,<sup>1</sup>
- (2) the petition fee,
- (3) a showing to the satisfaction of the Director that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to this paragraph was unavoidable, and
- (4) a terminal disclaimer and fee if the application was filed on or before June 8, 1995 or if the application is a design application.

The instant petition lacks item (3).

As to item (3), the showing of record is not sufficient to establish to the satisfaction of the Director that the delay was unavoidable within the meaning of 37 CFR §1.137(a).

The Office may revive an abandoned application if the delay in responding to the relevant outstanding office requirement is shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner to have been "unavoidable." See, 37 CFR § 1.137(a)(3). Decisions on reviving abandoned applications have adopted the reasonably prudent person standard in determining if the delay was unavoidable. Ex parte Pratt, 1887 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 31, 32-33 (Comm'r Pat. 1887) (the term "unavoidable" is applicable to ordinary human affairs, and requires no more greater care or diligence than is generally used and observed by prudent and careful men in relation to their most important business."); In re Mattullath, 38 App. D.C. 497, 514-15 (D.C. Cir. 1912); Ex parte Henrich, 1913 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 139, 141 (Comm'r Pat. 1913). In addition, decisions on revival are made on a "case by case basis, taking all the facts and circumstances into account." Smith v. Mossinghoff, 671 F.2d 533, 538, 213 USPQ 977, 982 (D.C. Cir. 1982). A petition to revive an application as unavoidably abandoned cannot be granted where petitioner has failed to meet his or her burden of establishing the cause of the unavoidable delay. Haines v. Quigg, 673 F. Supp. 314, 5 USPQ2D 1130 (N.D. Ind. 1987).

The showing of record is inadequate to establish unavoidable delay within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 133 and 37 CFR 1.137(a).<sup>2</sup> Specifically, an application is "unavoidably" abandoned only where petitioner, or counsel for petitioner, takes all action necessary for a proper response to the outstanding Office action, but through the intervention of unforeseen circumstances, such as failure of mail, telegraph, facsimile, or the negligence of otherwise reliable employees, the response is not timely received in the Office.<sup>3</sup>

Petitioner contends the issue fee transmittal form with authorization included a credit card authorization. The Issue fee transmittal also contained authorization to charge

---

<sup>1</sup> In a nonprovisional application abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may be met by the filing of a continuing application. In an application or patent, abandoned or lapsed for failure to pay the issue fee or any portion thereof, the required reply must be the payment of the issue fee or any outstanding balance thereof.

<sup>2</sup>See MPEP 711(c)(III)(c)(2) for a discussion of the requirements for a showing of unavoidable delay.

<sup>3</sup>Ex parte Pratt, 1887 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 31 (Comm'r Pat. 1887).

A review of the record shows that the issue fee transmittal was not received until after the three month reply period. Although the issue fee transmittal form contained a certificate of mailing dated April 9, 2007, the form was not received in the Office until May 9, 2007.

Where a certificate of mailing under 37 CFR 1.8, but not a postcard receipt, is relied upon in a petition to withdraw the holding of abandonment, see 37 CFR 1.8(b) and MPEP § 512. As stated in 37 CFR 1.8(b)(3) the statement that attests to the previous timely mailing or transmission of the correspondence must be on a personal knowledge basis, or to the satisfaction of the Director of the USPTO. If the statement attesting to the previous timely mailing is not made by the person who signed the certificate of mailing (i.e., there is no personal knowledge basis), then the statement attesting to the previous timely mailing should include evidence that supports the conclusion that the correspondence was actually mailed (e.g., copies of a mailing log establishing that correspondence was mailed for that application).

The certificate of mailing was executed by Mary Mundy who has not provided a statement. Further, the statement provided by Attorney Sawyer is not sufficient to establish the issue fee transmittal was timely mailed.

### **Alternative Venue**

Petitioner may wish to consider filing a petition to revive based on unintentional abandonment under 37 CFR 1.137(b). A grantable petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(b) must be accompanied by the required reply, the required petition fee (\$750.00 for small entity, \$1500 for other than small entity), and a statement that the **entire** delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(b) was unintentional.

The filing of a petition under 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(b) cannot be intentionally delayed, and therefore, must be filed promptly. A person seeking revival due to unintentional delay cannot make a statement that the delay was unintentional unless the entire delay, including the delay from the date it was discovered that the application was abandoned until the filing of the petition to revive under 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(b), was unintentional. A statement that the delay was unintentional is not appropriate if petitioner intentionally delayed the filing of a petition for revival under 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(b).

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:

By mail: Mail Stop Petition

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

By facsimile: (571) 273-8300

By delivery service: U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
(FedEx, UPS, DHL, etc.) Randolph Building  
401 Dulany Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314

Telephone inquiries should be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3215.



Charlema R. Grant  
Petitions Attorney  
Office of Petitions